

#### REMARKS

The response to the Office Action was due on March 20, 2007. The response is being submitted within two months after this date, and a petition for an extension of time for two months is submitted with this response.

#### ALLOWED CLAIMS

Applicant acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claims 37-65 and 69-78 are allowed.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claims 5 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Applicant has cancelled claim 9, and incorporated that subject matter into currently amended independent claim 1. The subject matter of claim 5 has been incorporated into new claim 79, which also contains the subject matter of original claim 1, modified to indicate that the diphenylmethane diisocyanate prepolymer component is present and additionally comprises an allophanate, and that the "alternative" diphenylmethane diisocyanate monomer component of claim 1 is optionally present. Original claim 1 had recited, in pertinent part, "at least one of: i) a diphenylmethane diisocyanate prepolymer component; or ii) a diphenylmethane diisocyanate monomer component".

### 35 USC §112 REJECTION

Claims 66–68 were rejected under 35 USC §112 for reasons of record at page 2 of the Office Action.

Applicant acknowledges that the recitation of “polyurethane sealant” in claims 66-68, as well as in claim 63, was a typographical error, as can be seen from the dependency of these claims ultimately from claim 37, directed to a multicomponent formulation. The term “polyurethane sealant” has therefore been replaced with the term “multicomponent formulation” in each of those claims, which depend ultimately from allowed claim 37. Claim 66 and claim 34 have also been clarified to place them in proper Markush format. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 USC §112 rejection of claims 66-68 be withdrawn.

### 35 USC §102(b) and 35 USC §103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-25, 35-36, and 67-68 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b), and claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36 and 66-68 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over US Patent No. 5,925,781 to Pantone et al., for reasons of record at pages 2-5 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses.


Applicant has cancelled claim 10 without prejudice or disclaimer, and subject to the right to present the same, together with the subject matter of original claim 1, in a continuing application.

In view of the incorporation of the allowable subject matter of claim 9 into claim 1, from which claims 2-8, and 11-36 ultimately depend, and the correction of the typographical error in claims 66-68, which ultimately depend from allowed claim 37, Applicant requests that the 35 USC §102(b) and 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36 and 66-68 be withdrawn.

With the cancellation of claims 9 and 10, and the addition of new independent claim 79, an excess claim fee of \$200.00 is due, and a cheque for that amount accompanies this response.

In view of the amendments and remarks contained above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b), §103(a) and §112 rejections, and request that a Formal Notice of Allowance be issued for claims 1-8, and 11-79. Should the Examiner have any questions about the above amendments or remarks, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Joseph G. Curatolo, Esq. (Reg. No. 28,837)  
Curatolo Sidoti Co., LPA  
24500 Center Ridge Road, Suite 280  
Cleveland, OH 44145

Customer No. 23575

Telephone: (440) 808-0011  
Facsimile: (440) 808-0657  
Attorney for Applicant

Date 5-18-2007